Case 1:25-cv-00565-JLT-BAM Document 17 Filed 12/02/25 Page 2 of 2

dismiss an action without a court order by filing "a notice of dismissal before the opposing party serves either an answer or a motion for summary judgment." Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(i). Plaintiff Alana Dunn has stated her intent to dismiss this case without prejudice and no defendant has filed an answer or motion for summary judgment. However, Emma Dunn also is pursuing claims in this action. As a result, the notice of voluntary dismissal is only proper and effective as to Alana Dunn's action against defendants.

To the extent Alana Dunn requests a refund of the filing fee for this action, her request will be denied. The Court is unable to return the filing fee. "[V]oluntary dismissal of an action . . . does not entitle the litigant to a refund of filing fees." *See Silva v. Jackson*, No. 1:25-cv-00458-KES-EPG, 2025 WL 2432840, *1 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2025) (quoting *Grindling v. Martone*, No. 12-00361 LEK/BMK, 2012 WL 4502954, at *2 (D. Haw. Sept. 28, 2012)); *Hardy v. Stokes*, No. 2:24-cv-1798 DJC AC P, 2025 WL 2258554, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2025) (noting "courts have generally denied requests for refunds after the commencement of a case, even when the case has been voluntarily dismissed by plaintiff"); *Lopez v. Doe*, No. 5:23-cv-01924-FWS-AJR, 2024 WL 5422706, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 29, 2024) (collecting cases and noting multiple courts have found there is no statutory basis or precedent for returning a filing fee to a *pro se* plaintiff). Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 1. Alana Dunn's action against defendants is terminated by operation of law without further order from the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i).
- 2. Alana Dunn's request for a refund of the filing fee is **DENIED**.
- The Clerk of the Court is directed to terminate <u>only</u> Alana Dunn on the docket and the matter remains open.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **December 2, 2025**